

With the writer's  
compliments

LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
11 FEB 1915

A PLEA FOR A BROADER STANDPOINT IN  
PSYCHOANALYSIS

A PLEA FOR A BROADER STANDPOINT IN  
PSYCHOANALYSIS

By MEYER SOLOMON, M.D.

CHICAGO

At the very outset I wish to state my general attitude toward the Freudian school. It is not that of an iconoclast, an image-breaker, an idol-shatterer. It is not that of an outsider, maliciously intent upon throwing stones or of bringing down in ruins a wonderful and inspiring structure, reared by much labor, thought and untiring effort. It is not the attitude of a revolutionist or anarchist seeking to destroy and annihilate *in toto* that which does not entirely conform to his own ideas, convictions and beliefs. I approach the problem from a different viewpoint. I admire and respect the Freudians for the great work they have done. I have had my mind virtually opened up for me, in many respects, by reading Freudian literature. I have marvelled at the indefatigable energy and the remarkable ability displayed by the leading Freudians. They have attacked, one after the other, the various fields of normal and abnormal psychology. They have endeavored to explain the various types of human activities, of human conduct, normal and abnormal, in its many phases. They have endeavored to penetrate to the very nucleus of these problems. He who reads the Freudian writings cannot help but gain much knowledge from them. Such a reader must also accept, at its face value, much of what is thus taught him. Before one attempts to condemn any person or group of persons one should do one's utmost to come into sympathy with them. Only in that way can we understand them, fully appreciate them at their true value, and criticize them justly and worthily. Otherwise our criticism is worthless, is tinged with animosity, partakes of the note of personal like and dislike, is unfair, biased, partial and unscientific. In my own behalf I may say that I have studied the Freudian theories and conclusions with patience, with sympathy and with an open mind. I have endeavored to see things from their point of view, to understand and to grasp their symbolism, to find the

great truths which they have expounded, to appreciate their touch of genius and their gift of interpretation. I have assumed toward the Freudian school the same attitude that I assumed in judging the cubists and the futurists in art, before at once joining in the general chorus of derision against them. To put the matter in a popular way, I may say that I am not on the outside looking in or on the inside looking out, although both of these methods are useful, but I am on the inside looking around and in-between.

In an analysis of a picture or an individual or a school or social conditions or what not, if we wish to be fair, to be absolutely just, to be dispassionate and scientific, to really and truly discover the truth, we must seek the faults and errors as well as the advantages and truths, the bad as well as the good, the underside as well as the upper-side. Then only can we make allowances for the failings and truly appreciate the strong points. Our love for anything must not make us blind to the defects. Our criticism, though just, be it but tempered with goodness and with kindness will not lead us astray but rather will it give us the only proper and ideal attitudes and viewpoints.

An appreciation of this important truth should not, however, check us from criticizing where criticism is necessary and of opposing that which is not right. We sympathize with the criminal, but we cannot permit him to believe that his conduct is right and just. We feel for the chronic inebriate, the chronically insane, the sexual pervert and others, but we must protect the individual, society and the race whenever and wherever necessary. We understand the motive which leads to the engendering of animosities and hates, of narrow-mindedness and bigotry, of oppression and injustice, of murder and war—but we must condemn and endeavor to overcome, prevent and eliminate such methods of reaction.

For this reason all criticism of the Freudian theories and conclusions, if given honestly and fairly, should be wholesomely welcome. It is with this spirit and with these ideas in mind that the remarks contained in this paper are offered.

The writer has followed Freudian literature fairly closely for more than four years. It has, in a way, fascinated and amused him. He was early convinced that there was much truth in Freudism, but try as much as he could, be as impartial and as un-

prejudiced as he could, he could never permit his better judgment to agree with the Freudians in certain very important theoretical and practical considerations. He always felt that he could go a certain distance with them and that then he must part company with them, because he could not accept as true that which they asserted had been positively proven to be true. He felt certain, from the very beginning, that there was something wrong somewhere. What it was he could not exactly say. He had a general feeling of disbelief, distrust, illusionment—but he could not place his finger on the key of the situation and explain just what was wrong with Freudism.

Of several things, however, he felt quite certain. He knew that man, including himself, was not constituted in the way which the Freudian school believed. He could see that the Freudians were building up a system of their own, and this, not in a truly unbiased, impartial and scientific manner. But he was early convinced that they had come to certain conclusions as a result of their analyses of psychoneuroses, dreams and other mental states; and that they were now doing their utmost to support these conclusions, to bring forward more and more proof of the correctness of their views, and to further develop their system. In endeavoring to attain this end, having started out with certain definite, preconceived views and dogmas, they made every attempt to force their clinical material, their analyses and interpretations in line with their general ideas, disregarding, in the meantime, all other paths of approach and all other methods of analysis and interpretation of psychoneuroses, of dreams and of other normal and abnormal mental states. There is no doubt in my own mind that as a result of continued persistence in this tendency there have arisen certain excesses of the Freudian school. Intent upon proof of their theories, they have made the serious mistake of fitting fact to theory and not theory to fact. As a result of this we find that in too many, if not most, of their analyses and interpretations they have indulged in very ingenious, fantastic, imaginative, improbable and too frequently impossible and even at times absurd explanations. The writer has continually regretted this tendency on the part of Freudians. I believe that they themselves have probably or rather undoubtedly recognized the existence of undiscovered deficiencies in their system and theories. That Jung was keenly

aware of this is proven by the fact that Jung finally found himself compelled to come forward with a modification of the Freudian theories. All Freudians have surely appreciated that there must be some valid cause, other than distaste for the sexuality so rampant in Freudism, for the opposition of many, for the indifference of others for the disappointment of still others with respect to Freudism as it has been developed and as it stands to-day.

True, every great reform, every new thought, every worthwhile discovery must expect to meet with the same reception. But indifference, disappointment and opposition are not without cause and should not be in vain. There must be something wrong somewhere. Either the new order of things or the new discovery is imperfect and defective in one or more respects, or its method of application and the manner in which it is used is faulty. The history of education, progress and civilization has proven that, in due time, the source of the trouble is finally located and the condition remedied. We will find the following to be the case in very many instances before the final acceptance of new great theories: A great theory is discovered and given to the world. Certain flaws or defects are detected. Sometimes the entire theory is discarded, neglected or discredited because some of the minor or accessory theories are not proven or are disproven. But, eventually, what occurs? The theory is modified or corrected in certain respects to conform to the newer findings. And what were previously considered incompatible findings are found to be supplementary or, at least, harmonizable one with the other. This harmonization and compatibility have been accomplished by the rejection of the faulty portions of the original theory, the substitution therefore of the newer findings or beliefs, and hence follows a revision or modification of the original idea. Frequently the basic principles of the first system are sustained while the minor, secondary or accessory theories have been discarded, modified or replaced. This, indeed, is the progress of science. Instances of it are numerous. In the field of biology we find abundant illustration of this general truth. Darwin's theory of natural selection has been modified, Lamarck's theory of the inheritance of acquired traits is now generally discredited, Weismann's theory of the continuity of the germ plasma has been accepted, the effects of racial poisons on the germ cells are appreciated, the results of

isolation, inbreeding and mutations are explained by the Mendelian theory, and so on.

To advance we must be willing to give up old disproven beliefs and accept the newer things, the newer advances. To change is no admission of defeat. When in the right direction and when based on sound proof and solid foundation it is rather an indication of progress. He who forever remains fixed in his ideas, who refuses to accept the new and, clinging tenaciously to his old tenets and set beliefs, persistently declines to change and to advance in the path of progress and of civilization, fast falls behind the times and is soon forever lost in the never-ceasing rush to get on and on. In the struggle for life, in our efforts to adapt ourselves to our environment and to meet the difficulties which present themselves and to deal openly with the situation or conflict, we know only too well that we must calmly and resolutely take stock. We must carefully and logically go over the situation at hand, reason regarding it, properly weigh the facts and the situation, and, after having discovered the difficulty and found out what was wrong with the course of events, we solve the problem by adjusting ourselves to the new circumstances which present themselves to us or by modifying the external conditions or both. In this way only can we continue to survive at a high level of efficiency and to lead a useful and successful life.

The Freudians themselves have done much to teach us this lesson and to impress it upon us more strongly. And since Freudism has met with such opposition, it behooves the adherents of the Freudian school to view the situation as from a mountain-top, to remove themselves temporarily from the common herd and to survey the field dispassionately, impartially and honestly.

I will repeat again that there is something wrong somewhere with Freudism. We may have to lop off some portions of the theory here and substitute others there. If this must be done, and every impartial critic will, I believe, agree to this, then I can only say that the sooner this is done the better will it be for Freudism itself, for abnormal psychology, for normal psychology, for mental science in general, and, last but by no means least, for our patients.

Freud and his school have certainly given us many worthy

contributions. Among the most important of these may be mentioned the following:

(1) They have given us a needed stimulus for a more humanistic psychology. Although the Freudians have no doubt been too sweeping in their conclusions and declarations and have been carried away on a wave of enthusiasm, it was what we should have but naturally expected from a certain proportion of the enthusiasts, because the psychology of Freud opened up for all of us, especially for students of abnormal psychology, a new and wide field of study, very fascinating, with much opportunity for speculation and individual interpretation. Among the greatest contributions of the Freudian school we must appreciate that Freud has made popular a new psychology, a humanistic, living psychology, which unearths for us the structure, constitution and mechanisms of the mind of man, based on his feelings, his yearnings, his cravings, his anticipations, his successes, his failures, his realizations. Freudian mental mechanisms must be understood to be appreciated. The mechanisms of repression, of sublimation, of projection, of condensation, etc., are here very illuminating. The mechanism of compensation by transference and substitution in one or more of many ways is most necessary for an understanding of the working of man's mind, normal or abnormal. The basic principles of determinism and wish-fulfilment, frequently symbolic in expression, are inestimably, valuable contributions. The importance of these mental mechanisms cannot be too highly appreciated.

(2) The psychosexual development of man has been earnestly studied. The Freudians have not only endeavored to show us the various complicated mental processes but have also delved into the content of the various psychic trends and processes. They accumulated evidence which led them to lay more and more stress on the sexual element. It is here that they have met their greatest opposition and adverse criticism—and, in my opinion, justly so. In spite of continued opposition, criticism and indifference, they have gone ahead unravelling, in their own way, the sexual lives of their patients, and explaining the various psychic phenomena on this basis. Beginning with hysteria, the field has gradually broadened to include the psychoneuroses in general, some of the psychoses (paranoia and dementia præcox—which latter psycho-

sis, however, Jung now agrees cannot be explained on a purely sexual etiology) and the various neurotic states. The infantile and childhood sexuality has been elaborated, and following upon this the normal adult sexual life and the sexual aberrations have been explained. They have further explained and defined with great definiteness, at least to their own satisfaction, the rôle of sexuality in the production of the somatic and psychic symptoms in abnormal psychologic conditions, and this was yet further extended to explain racial psychology as illustrated in the formation of myths, fairy-tales and folk-lore. Religion, literature and art have been attacked from the standpoint of the sex motive. Other mental states, such as dreams, day-dreaming, castle-and-air building, reveries, hypnagogic states and states of abstraction, slips of the tongue and pen, hypnotism and a host of other normal and abnormal mental states, of protean nature, have been brought under the rubric of the Freudian mechanisms and theories, and a decided attempt has been made to point out their sexual content and to indicate the rôle of sexuality in their evolution and production. Character formation has likewise been studied from this same standpoint. And still the work goes on.

In all this work, as mentioned above, the Freudians have gone into certain uncalled-for excesses and extravagances, especially with reference to the sexual content and sexual implications of the various mental states. Indeed, I believe I am not exaggerating the true state of affairs when I assert that much of man's conduct, normal and abnormal, sleeping and waking, conscious and unconscious, physical and mental, has been scrutinized from the sexual standpoint.

The errors, however, which have necessarily crept into their work as a result of this narrow and false conception of the significance of man's conduct, should not, as a result of an over-reaction in the opposite direction, make us blind to the valuable contributions which have been given to us by the Freudian school. They have endeavored to trace the sexual evolution and sexual development of man—and we should give careful consideration to all such efforts.

(3) Still more specifically, Freud has done much to explain the sexual aberrations.

(4) Their contributions to normal and abnormal psychology, apart from their sexual theories, have been very numerous, extensive and penetrating.

(5) They have given us a broader standpoint in mental analysis and psychotherapy.

(6) They have given us an inspiration for and a new method of psychoanalysis.

(7) If the work of the Freudian school has done anything for which it deserves recognition, we must give one of the very first places to that tendency which is here mentioned last, for the sake of impressing it upon the reader the more deeply. I refer to the modern tendency toward analysis, rather than mere description, in psychopathology and psychiatry. I do not mean to infer here that description is not an essential, a *sine qua non*, but I would insist that the present tendency so marked everywhere, of not resting content with description alone but of laboriously tracing the genesis, evolution and end-result of the psychic trend or psychic picture which has been presented to us—this tendency toward analysis has come to be a part of psychopathology and psychiatry since the advent and spread of the Freudian movement.

We note to-day throughout medical and psychological circles quite a definite opposition to Freudism as it is being expounded by the foremost supporters of the Freudian school. In spite of the numerous contributions of the Freudian school, Freudism has been very slow in gaining new adherents and in increasing the ranks of those who believe in and follow its teachings. This general opposition has been present from the very beginning. Why are the principles of Freudism not more generally accepted? There are many reasons for the disbelief and antagonism which are so prevalent with respect to the Freudian teachings.

The opponents of the Freudian school may be grouped into a number of different classes. Some there are who do not know anything about Freudism, are not interested in it, have no opinion in the matter at all, and hence can lend no aid to Freudian beliefs; yet, by their inactivity and their willy-nilly attitude, they really give passive opposition to its principles. Others there are who are opposed to Freudism because it is something new. They refuse to accept the newer things. Let the new idea, new method or what not be what it may, they are opposed to it. They are the

moss-backs, the regulars, the stand-patters. They do not like a change. To them things are good enough as they are; yes, they feel that things are all for the best in this best of all possible worlds. Why change, they ask, when things are pretty safe now and we are getting along pretty well? The third class includes those who have studied Freudism but are still skeptical and unconvinced. A fourth group comprises those who have studied Freudism, found it wanting and have given it up. Many of these have investigated the subject at hand, have found it faulty in more than one respect, and, having followed the trail to a certain point, have turned about and discarded the whole theory and practice of the Freudian school because of certain failings. They are comparable to those others who indict a nation for the faults of some of its citizens, who are prejudiced against a whole race because of certain undesirable traits in some or all of its members, who give up everything for some one thing, who throw away the good and the bad. Another class includes those who, because of certain ingrained beliefs and perhaps even blind faiths and prejudices, not only refuse to accept new ideas opposed to those they formerly held, but, furthermore, will not hear of them, read about them or investigate them but nevertheless are whole-heartedly opposed to them; especially when these new ideas strike at the roots of their beliefs and convictions are they vehement in their denunciation and opposition. It is they who, through a sense of false prudery and a distaste for anything which digs deeply into sexuality, consider the sex question in all its aspects to be nasty, filthy, unclean, immoral and degrading. Consequently they are at war with the Freudian school because of the great stress laid upon the sexual element by all Freudians. In a different group come those who, finding certain mistakes and defects, still recognize the truths and advantages, and endeavor to modify the idea or method in so far as they can.

On the other hand, amongst many of the adherents of Freudism, we find men who almost uncritically accept all of the new or strange ideas which may be promulgated by members of the school, and even go the originator one or two better by running into extravagances and excesses. They have become extremists, over-enthusiasts, almost frenzied and fanatical in their convictions. They are truly ultra-Freudian.

Most of those who support Freudism and all that it stands for have given the subject much attention and have devoted considerable time and energy in study, thinking, writing and practicing Freudian principles. They have certainly shown themselves to be ingenious, resourceful thinkers and unceasing workers.

However, throughout their work, as has been mentioned before, sexuality is persistently and preëminently talked about and harped upon, so that as a consequence the sex element has indeed been made the dominant note of Freudism, and the importance of sexuality in normal and abnormal human activities has been tremendously and almost unbelievably magnified. Truly, if one reads all that the leaders of the Freudian movement say, one must conclude that sexuality and sexuality alone is the center and the periphery and everything else in the universe.

Those of you who have read Galton's "Essays on Eugenics" will recall his wise caution to his fellow-workers in the eugenic movement. He told them not to be too rash, too enthusiastic, too premature in their judgment and conclusions. He asked them not to make baseless and unsupported statements and groundless and unproved claims since, by those very methods, in the course of time, they would bring discredit upon the fair name of the embryonic science of eugenics. And this same caution should have been heeded by the followers of Freud. It is because they have woefully and shamefully neglected this very wise caution and sound advice that they have raised such a storm of opposition and have brought so much discredit upon the Freudian school and upon psychoanalysis. Almost all of them have been too radical, too dogmatic, too unreasonable, too previous in their recommendations, too sweeping in their declarations, too easily carried away by their enthusiasm and their feelings. Such methods can but lead to certain disaster and failure. It is because this rule has been disregarded and so many of the Freudians have done and said just those things which they should not have done and said, that we find so much opposition to the acceptance of Freudian principles, so much misunderstanding of many of their really worth-while beliefs, so much disinterestedness in their writings, so much skepticism with regard to and so much suspicion of everything that sounds Freudian. And for this same reason so many of their statements have been unconvincing, far-fetched and the immature products of uncritical imagination and speculation.

It is not my purpose here to enter into a critical exposition of the various Freudian theories. I have elsewhere<sup>1</sup> offered some brief critical remarks on the theory and practice of Freudian psychoanalysis. I shall not repeat them in this paper. But I wish to make a few pertinent remarks anent the general tendencies of the Freudian school which require correction and in which modification is essential for future advance and for dissemination of the psychoanalytic standpoint, as well as in the interest of truth and of scientific psychology. I shall not discuss these points but shall content myself with a mere enumeration of the following:

1. I must criticize their failure to properly define and limit their terms or the lack of formulation in the expression of their ideas. I may refer, for example, for specific illustrations, to their use of the terms *censor*, *unconscious*, *wish*, *sexual*, and others.
2. We must note their assumption of an individualistic, psychological conception of man and of the universe, while the truly biological, or at least the psychobiological viewpoint receives but scant, if any, attention.
3. They have further adopted a purely sexual viewpoint, of the universe as well as of man, instead of giving impartial consideration to all of our instincts, especially to the primitive and powerful instinct of self-preservation. Although I have already devoted some space to a brief reference to this tendency or defect, I feel impelled, at this time, to give this matter a little further attention. The Freudians have developed the idea that man's sexual impulse is made up of certain components or trends. This is seen in their conception of our polymorphous perverse sexual, bisexual (better called ambisexual) and incestuous tendencies. They have adhered to their theories and have unceasingly followed up their trail. With increasing resistance and indifference on the part of others, they have been more persistent in their own ideas and have endeavored so much the more vigorously to bring forth proof of them. And in their attempts at proof of these ideas, in their difficulty of bringing all psychic phenomena within the confines of their theories, they have not only neglected other facts or theories which may have been helpful and applicable in certain instances in which their own theories were not at all or

<sup>1</sup> On "The Analysis and Interpretation of Dreams Based on Various Motives and on the Theory of Psychoanalysis—Reply to Dr. James J. Putnam, etc.," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, June—September, 1914.

only partially applicable, but they have also been compelled to use Freudian mechanisms to prove that the content of the various psychic states was always dependent upon sexuality, so that, as a natural consequence, the mental mechanisms of substitution, condensation, symbolism, or what not have been used as explanations in support of sexuality in cases where the sexual element really played little or no rôle. Thus many of the analyses of Freudians, though very fascinating and ingenious, have been too unsupported, too far-fetched, too improbable, and frequently too impossible, and not infrequently actually absurd. They have argued and have proven too many of their cases by analogy, although we know very well that, as others have so aptly expressed it, analogy does not necessarily prove anything; it merely illustrates.

Conclusions have been drawn—nobody has proven them, nor have many come forward to take up the cudgels to disprove them.

It is this sexual element in Freudism as it stands to-day that has been the root of most of the trouble.

The writer will say, for his part, that he does not object to reading and discussing sexuality in any of its phases. He understands and believes in the essential truth of the polymorphous perverse sexual predisposition or rather *possibility* of man as shown most clearly in the developing child. The history of human marriage relationships and the development of our family and social life, with our present-day ethical and moral restrictions and inhibitions in all civilized societies point quite clearly to the primitive and original sex tendencies and possibilities and sex relationships of the male and female members of the family. The reason for these marriage restrictions are, of course, plain to us all—they are for the social welfare, and go hand in hand with progress, development civilization and morality. Any fair-minded person should not object to learning the full facts concerning his origin, his evolution, his general make-up and his primitive tendencies or possibilities—whether it be in the sexual or any other sphere of man's activities. And it may be said that many cases presented by Freudians have given much proof of the truth of their ideas with respect to man's general sexual make-up, tendencies and possibilities. But where they have erred very seriously has been in this respect. They have used this incestuous, bisexual, and poly-

morphous perverse sexual predisposition, or better, possibility of man as the sole and complete explanation of certain mental states and human relationships which were not at all or only partially dependent upon them. In this way arose the almost unpardonable excesses of the Freudian school.

Although the writer appreciates the tremendous power and far-reaching influence of the sex motive in man, nevertheless he must differ decidedly from those Freudians who seem to insist that sexuality is the be-all and the end-all of existence. It is not at the root, it is not at the source of origin and the cause of development of all of man's mental tendencies and activities. Nor is it at the bottom of all psychopathologic states. As I have shown elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> sexuality, even in the Freudian sense, can never explain all or most dreams. And, it may be said in parenthesis, not all the dreams analyzed by Freudians on the basis of sexuality have really depended upon the sex motive; so that, in these instances, their interpretations have been misleading, and at times real fabrications. Substitution and symbolism have been used to the extreme in the attempt to fit fact to theory, to explain all dreams in accordance with their preconceived notions. This has been true not only in their analyses of dreams but also in their analyses of neuroses and psychoneuroses and in all other fields of normal and abnormal psychology into which the Freudians have penetrated. I could cite typical and abundant instances of the most extravagant assertions and unfounded and fantastic analyses of this sort. But I think that this is unnecessary. For personal conviction of the validity of my statements I can do no better than advise you personally to investigate the literature of the Freudian school.

4. Their theories of psychical determinism and over-determinism have been carried beyond bounds and have been given too literal and too technical an application.

5. The rôle of the infantile and early childhood tendencies and experiences has been over-emphasized.

6. Most to be criticized is their ever-broadening conception of sexuality and its application. As has been mentioned heretofore, in addition to ordinary heterosexual relationships, they have called attention to polymorphous perverse sexual, ambisexual and incestuous tendencies, physical or psychical, conscious or subcon-

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*

scious. In the case of paranoia, however, they have gone even further and have referred to self-love as sexual and called this the narcissistic aspect of the sexual impulse. Further, their conception of sexual has been so broad that it has been given a connotation which would include as sexual the slightest and most distant and indirect physical, mental and moral reverberations of the relations between the sexes, and is much wider than the conception which is usually accorded by us to the word *love*, viewed from a sexual standpoint. In fact, sexual has been made synonymous with the word *love*, used in an unqualified sense, whether sexual or not. Nay more, all bodily and mental feeling, whether conscious or unconscious, however slight in degree or brief in duration, all tendencies and aspirations, all efforts at self-expression, all human conduct, all human instincts, all human energy, in fact the vital energy of the universe has been given a sexual setting, and has been included within the purview of the word *libido*, the latter being looked at in a sexual light. It is but natural that very serious complications should arise from such a new, wide and all-inclusive conception of man's sexual impulse.<sup>3</sup>

7. Their theory of psychical repression and their insistence on the significance of amnesia and of resistance to association of ideas have been carried far beyond reasonable grounds; so much so that they have been made to apply almost universally to thoughts and tendencies not clearly conscious.

8. Symbolism, almost always based on sexuality, has likewise been carried to the extreme.

9. A clear separation between analysis and interpretation, and between the interpretation of the patient and that of the physician has not been made.

10. A loose method of reasoning and of proof by analogy, of jumping to conclusions and of making broad generalizations and dogmatic, unproved assertions has been adopted.

11. This has been based on their psychology, which is defective in several notable respects, as I have tried to point out elsewhere.<sup>4</sup>

12. The result of these tendencies is evidenced in the development of a new school of thought, which has been called Freudism

<sup>3</sup> Jung has now discarded this sexual conception of libido or the vital energy.

<sup>4</sup> *Loc. cit.*

or Freudianism. Whether or not you will agree to go so far as to call it a cult, a sect, a creed, or what not, I think most of the defenders and critics of the movement will agree to call it a school, with set dogmas and specific standpoints. All cases for psychoanalysis are judged in this light, and for this reason each new case is not analyzed individually, impartially, and free from prejudice borne of other cases of the same or of an allied nature.

We have just considered the most glaring defects in Freudism. However, in spite of the numerous and serious errors of omission and commission noted heretofore, we must certainly ungrudgingly approve of the following tendencies which stand out clearly in all their work:

- (1) The analytic tendency.
- (2) The dynamic viewpoint.
- (3) Most of the mental mechanisms.
- (4) The inclusion of the sexual instinct in their analytic efforts.
- (5) The desire to bring system and order into mental science where comparative confusion and chaos existed before.

It must, nevertheless, be apparent to all that the Freudian school must take a broader standpoint than has been their wont up to date. And this must not be one limited by their own psychology or by any other psychology, but should be founded broadly on the biological or psychobiological make-up of man, with due consideration for all of man's instincts, especially the two fundamental instincts of self-preservation and race-preservation, as well as the various other instincts built up on them. This seems to be absolutely essential.

So broad should be the viewpoint that the question presents itself to me whether the term *psychoanalysis* is really broad enough, and whether another more comprehensive and more all-inclusive term, such as *bioanalysis* or *psychobioanalysis* should not be substituted for it, especially if we would include the analysis of the somatic symptoms of the psychoneuroses, psychoses and other psychic states, as well as the multiform conduct of man at every stage of evolution and development.

Although this paper is not intended to take up critically any of the Freudian standpoints or theories, nevertheless I feel that this point needs greater emphasis than can be given to it by a mere passing remark calling attention to this aspect of the problem, as

referred to in the above sentence. In their analyses and interpretations of the genesis of the somatic symptoms of hysteria and of other psychoneuroses the Freudians have endeavored to explain the physical symptoms and signs on an individualistic, psychological basis (and this, too, in its sexual relations). It has been contended that the somatic symptoms have a definite individual psychological significance and are more or less definite symbols of the sexual activity of the patient. I believe that it is in this respect that the members of the Freudian school have erred very seriously. In this connection I must refer to the unsupported conclusions of Clarke,<sup>5</sup> of New York City, in his recent series of papers on tics and ticquers. Clarke, having accepted the conclusions of the Freudian school *en masse*, was naturally led to the views which he expresses in his three papers on tics. An extension of this theory would bring all acquired habit movements under this same heading. And if we include inherited, instinctive habit movements or tendencies as well as acquired habit movements and tics, we see at once how practically all physical activities, normal or abnormal, must be conceived of in the same way. Now, as a matter of fact, I believe that the somatic symptoms of hysteria, of dementia *præcox*, of tics and habit movements are not primarily individualistic, psychologic expressions but on the other hand are merely the physical or somatic accompaniments of a biological reaction which has both psychical and physical relations. Our biological relations are probably always psychophysical, although in many cases either the psychical or the physical reaction may appear in the foreground, dominate the picture and so seem to be the exclusive method of reaction. Our condition in sleep is our standard in this respect. There we find our somatic symptoms (anesthesia, etc.) in conjunction with our psychic aspect. This applies to all similar states of mental regression or dissociation—abstraction, the varying degrees of hypnosis, hysteria, dementia *præcox*, tics and the like. These somatic symptoms are not fundamentally psychologically significant in the sense in which the Freudian school would have us believe (as in the theory of con-

<sup>5</sup> His three papers, which appeared in the *Medical Record*, New York, in the issues of February 7 and 28, and March 28, 1914, are entitled: (1) "Some Observations Upon the Etiology of Mental Torticollis"; (2) "A Further Study Upon Mental Torticollis as a Psychoneurosis"; and (3) "Remarks Upon Mental Infantilism in the Tic Neurosis."

version to explain the somatic symptoms and signs of hysteria) but they can be fully explained only, or at least in the great majority of cases, biologically. In other words they are but methods of reaction common to all people, and are primarily dependent not upon psychological facts but upon the organic constitution of the nervous system with its biological and physiological method of reaction, as determined by its evolutionary life history.<sup>6</sup> Comparative psychology and biology is of infinite aid to us here. This field has been indeed neglected by the Freudian school. Tics and many of the somatic symptoms to be found in the psychoneuroses and psychoses may be found among animals. And the ultimate explanation for the occurrence of these sensorimotor phenomena is, fundamentally, the same for the animals below us as it is for human beings. It is not my intention to develop this subject in this place since a comprehensive consideration of the somatic phenomena of the sort to which I have here referred would call for separate and lengthy discussion. But the point I wish to bring home is this: A study of the sensorimotor reactions cannot be confined to their possible psychic implications but must be on a broad psycho-physical basis. The study of the conduct of man and of the animals below him cannot be limited to the psychic sphere but must include the physical aspect. This is the true biological and evolutionary standpoint. This is what we mean by a real study of life and human conduct in its various phases and ramifications. And a real study of life, of the genesis and evolution and development of the various expressions of life in its physical, physiological and psychological bearings, may perhaps demand a broader name than *psychoanalysis*.

*Bioanalysis* suggests itself, but to many it may seem to be too broad a term, since, in the broad sense, it would include biochemical reactions and similar processes, and, furthermore, it would not lay sufficient stress on the psychic aspect of conduct. *Psychobioanalysis* would be broad enough and no valid objection to its use could be urged except its length and complexity. *Praxiology*, the term suggested by Mercier<sup>7</sup> for the science or study of con-

<sup>6</sup> Since writing this paper the writer has read G. Stanley Hall's excellent paper "A Synthetic Genetic Study of Fear" in the *American Journal of Psychology*, April, 1914, Vol. XXV, pp. 149-200, and succeeding numbers of the *American Journal of Psychology*. Dr. Hall views the somatic manifestations from the evolutionary, phylogenetic standpoint.

<sup>7</sup> "Conduct and Its Disorders, Biologically Considered," London, 1911.

duct, does not sufficiently bring to our minds the vitalistic and dynamic as opposed to the purely mechanistic and static standpoint. To return to the term *psychoanalysis*, we may agree that the term *psyche* is used synonymously with *mind*. Now, what are we to include under psychic or mental processes? Is sentiency or awareness or choice or memory or affectivity to be chosen as the simplest primeval psychic element?<sup>8</sup> If the psyche be conceived of from the standpoint of the vitalistic doctrine, so that all vital phenomena are psychic; if we view it in the biological sense, so that the mind or the psyche is used as the collective name for the functions of the sensorium in men and animals, thus including under psychic functions all the activities of the nervous system and all functions of like nature existing in organisms without special nerve fibers or nerve cells—that is, to include all phenomena of irritability, however primeval or simple—so that, in fact, affectivity, as represented in the simplest pleasure-pain state, becomes the simplest primeval psychic element—if, I say, the mind or psyche be viewed in this light, the term *psychoanalysis* may well be retained and can be used to apply to the analysis of the vital activities of animals and even plants. Unless *psychoanalysis* be used in this broad sense, it would not, it seems to me, be a satisfactory term to use to include within its compass the analysis of automatic processes, activities or reactions, and of the somatic manifestations of all psychic states.

Let us ever remember that the Freudian movement has had a good effect in arousing the interest of physicians generally in the problems of psychopathology (where, before, it was very difficult to attract an interested or appreciative audience), in giving us a more firmly fixed psychoanalytic tendency, a clearer dynamic standpoint and certain valuable mental mechanisms. May the movement live on. And may a broader, more sane, more impartial and more scientific application of the movement be put into working. In this direction I believe it is appreciated by the majority of the workers in this field that we need the aid of specialists in the various allied sciences of biology, anthropology, zoölogy, pedagogy, philology, criminology, etc. With their co-operation, with the natural correlation and checking up of results, analyses and interpretations and conclusions will surely mean

<sup>8</sup> G. Stanley Hall, *loc. cit.*, pp. 158 and 159.

much more dependable and accurate findings in the diverse fields of man's physical and mental activities.

The next step in the right direction should be the analytic study, along evolutionary and developmental lines, of the instincts, the mental and *normal* qualities, tendencies and general make-up of man. The study of the conduct and reactions of children, of savage and primitive races and of the higher animals should be a stepping stone in this onward march.

Permit me at this point to indicate the quite uniformly widespread misconception of the connotation of the term psychoanalysis. It is true that Freud first introduced this term, and because of the fact that he had developed a special method or technique of psychoanalysis (so-called free association, which was subsequently supplemented by the word association method as elaborated by Jung) it came to pass that the use of this term has been more or less, and by the Freudians and many others it has been entirely, restricted to the method of psychoanalysis as practiced by the Freudian school. Now, it is really immaterial just what particular method is employed so long as it be sound, rational and harmless, and so long as the results obtained are accurate, reliable and according to fact. It does not really matter, in our search for scientific truth, whether the final results have been obtained by word association, free association, hypnotism, or ordinary conversation. It is not my purpose to discuss the soundness or the value or the practical advantages of the various methods of attacking the problem. But we do know that the Freudian method, although not at fault *per se*, has been inextricably bound up with the specific Freudian attitude or standpoint, based on their psychology, and that psychoanalysis has also come to mean, to many, mental analysis according to the Freudian psychology, with its several defects and its erroneous conclusions of a theoretical and practical nature. Now, as a matter of fact, the term *psychoanalysis* is synonymous with *mental analysis* or any of its coëquals, and when used in an unqualified way should not have the special connotation that is now generally accorded to it. If we wish to refer specifically to the Freudian school of psychoanalysis we should limit the term by speaking of Freudian psychoanalysis or Freudo-analysis. This, it seems to me, is but just. The Freudian school has no monopoly on the word *psycho-*

*analysis.* As I have mentioned above, *psychoanalysis* should be used in its broadest sense if we would refer broadly to human conduct, physical or psychical.

In previous papers I have proven, at least to my own satisfaction, that Frued's theory of dreams is faulty in several notable respects;<sup>9</sup> I have tried to point out some of the more patent errors in the Freudian psychology;<sup>10</sup> and I have also endeavored to indicate the wider meanings of many of the sweeping, practical conclusions in neurotic, psychoneurotic and psychotic conditions.<sup>11</sup>

In conclusion I should like to quote, at some length, from my concluding remarks in a previous paper:<sup>12</sup>

"Despite the praiseworthiness of their motives in whatever work they (the Freudians) have undertaken, it is noteworthy that Freud and his followers have overshot the mark. Their most serious error has been that they have attached too great importance to the sexual element in all their cases. Psychoanalysis has, with the Freudians, unfortunately been side-tracked. This side-tracking has been in the direction of sexual analysis. So one-sided has been the work of the Freudians in this respect that Freudian analyses are nothing more nor less than sexual analyses.

"Man's mental life is rooted in instincts. But the sexual instinct, although very powerful and insistent in its demands for expression and gratification, is not the only instinct of man. . . . Our normal development and the mental disturbances to which we are subject are centered not only about our sexual instinct as a pivot but include within their scope all the other instincts, particularly the broadening aspect of the instinct of self-preservation. In the side-tracking of their work the Freudians have apparently entirely neglected all instincts other than the sexual

<sup>9</sup> "A Contribution to the Analysis and Interpretation of Dreams Based on the Motive of Self-preservation," *American Journal of Insanity*, July, 1914; "Analysis and Interpretation of Dreams Based on Various Motives," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, June-July, 1913; "Interpretation of Dreams Based on Various Motives," *International Clinics*, December, 1913; "Some Remarks on the Meaning of Dreams," *Medical Record*, January 31, 1914.

<sup>10</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>11</sup> Review of Conclusions Drawn From the Freudian School. *New York Medical Journal*, Nov. 8, 1913.

<sup>12</sup> *Loc. cit.*

instinct. As a consequence we find their conclusions are one-sided, biased, partial and hence much in error. . . .

"Freudism, as it stands today, must undergo wholesale modification, especially with respect to the conceptions of rigorous psychical determinism, psychical repression, sexuality and symbolism. . . . It must be clearly understood, however, that psychology and psychoanalysis must be differentiated from sexology and sexual analysis. Sexual analysis may well form a part of future psychoanalytic work, but not all psychoanalysis will be frank sexual analysis and nothing more. Let man be looked upon as the human being that he is. And when psychoanalysis is approached from this standpoint and not from a purely sexual basis, then we shall have a firmer, truer, better, more human psychology and a psychoanalysis which will be characterized by breadth of scope, by fairmindedness, guided by a real, scientific, unbiased search for truth."

In brief, let the Freudian school give up its purely individualistic, psycho-sexual conception of human conduct. Let them adopt a broader standpoint. Let them also take more notice of the work of others, such as Prince, whose recent book "The Unconscious"<sup>13</sup> is to be highly commended for its sound standpoints and for the definition and delimitation of "the unconscious," which for the Freudian school, seems too often to have such a vague and mystical connotation.

Janet, too, has not received the appreciation and recognition which is justly due him. And then there are the workers in comparative psychology (such as McDougall) and in **general** psychology (such as G. Stanley Hall).

The newer, broader, truly genetic and analytic standpoint must include, in addition to the individualistic and narrower psychological view point, the racial and wider biological method of approach so that, with the aid of comparative and genetic psychology, the entire evolutionary (including the phylogenetic and ontogenetic) life or rather world history will come in for careful consideration.

<sup>13</sup> New York, 1914.

*Genetic*





3 0112 061797475